

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA  
CLARKSBURG**

**WILLIAM COLBERT,**

Petitioner,

**v.**

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:12-CV-90  
CRIMINAL ACTION NO. 1:06-CR-94-1  
(Judge Bailey)**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,**

Respondent.

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

On this day, the above-styled matter came before the Court for consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge James E. Seibert. By Local Rule, this action was referred to Magistrate Judge Seibert for submission of a proposed report and a recommendation ("R&R"). Magistrate Judge Seibert filed his R&R on April 1, 2013 [Civ. Doc. 4; Cr. Doc. 153]. In that filing, the magistrate judge recommended that this Court deny the petitioner's Motion Under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 to Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct Sentence [Civ. Doc. 1; Cr. Doc. 148] with prejudice as untimely and for lack of jurisdiction as a second or successive motion for which petitioner did not receive authorization to file [Civ. Doc. 4 at 9; Cr. Doc 153 at 9].

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court is required to make a *de novo* review of those portions of the magistrate judge's findings to which objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or

recommendation to which no objections are addressed. **Thomas v. Arn**, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). In addition, failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of *de novo* review and the right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); **Snyder v. Ridenour**, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); **United States v. Schronce**, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). Here, objections to Magistrate Judge Seibert's R&R were due within fourteen (14) days of receipt, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b). The docket sheet reflects that service was accepted on April 3, 2013 [Civ. Doc. 5; Cr. Doc. 156]. On April 23, 2013, this Court granted the petitioner an extension of time to May 7, 2013, to file his objections [Civ. Doc. 7; Cr. Doc. 161]. To date, no objections have been filed.

Upon careful review of the report and recommendation, it is the opinion of this Court that the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation [Civ. Doc. 4; Cr. Doc. 153] should be, and is, hereby **ORDERED ADOPTED** for the reasons more fully stated in the magistrate judge's report. As such, this Court hereby **DENIES with prejudice** the petitioner's Motion Under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 to Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct Sentence [Civ. Doc. 1; Cr. Doc. 148] as untimely and for lack of jurisdiction as a second or successive motion for which petitioner did not receive authorization to file. Therefore, this matter is hereby **ORDERED STRICKEN** from the active docket of this Court. The Clerk is directed to enter a separate judgment in favor of the respondent.


As a final matter, this Court finds that the petitioner has not made the requisite "substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right" for a certificate of appealability; accordingly, this Court hereby **DENIES** a certificate of appealability to the extent that the

petitioner might seek one from this Court. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

It is so **ORDERED**.

The Clerk is directed to transmit copies of this Order to any counsel of record and to mail a copy to the *pro se* petitioner.

**DATED:** May 13, 2013.



**JOHN PRESTON BAILEY**  
**CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**